



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,719	03/29/2004	Pavel Berkin	017887-013400US	3740
29989	7590	02/20/2007	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			VY, HUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/20/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/812,719	BERKHIN, PAVEL
	Examiner Hung T. Vy	Art Unit 2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. As of entry of the amendment filed 12/18/2006, claims 7-14 are pending in this application as result of the cancellations of claims 1-6 and the new claims 7-17. Upon the reconsideration, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive (see response to argument below)

Drawings

2. The informal drawings are not of sufficient quality to permit examination. Accordingly, replacement drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to this Office action. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action.

Applicant is given a TWO MONTH time period to submit new drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.81. Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Failure to timely submit replacement drawing sheets will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The subject matter was not described in the specification are “at least some pages, within the collection, that do not belong to the set of one or more pages”, “current page”, “next page”, “outgoing link from the current page to a next page that belongs to the collection”, “establishing the next page as the current page” and “on the authority weights associated with the pages that match the search query”.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 7, the claim is rendered indefinite because it is not clear. The Application needs to clarify how assigning weights to the document in the set, also allow assigning the weight to the documents that do not belong to the set. Without this clarification, the claim is indefinite because it is unknown which documents outside the set are weighted.

Claims 8-14 depend from rejected claim 7 thereby render these dependent claims indefinite.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: the line 8, the word "no' should change to –not--. Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 7-9 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Page (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,999).

With respect to claims 7 and 14, as best understood, Page discloses a computer-implemented method for computer-implemented method for presenting a set of search results, the method comprising: assigning, to each page of a set of one or more pages, an authority weight (i.e., "ranking" (column 4, line 47-54)); wherein the authority weight (i.e., "ranking") assigned to each page (i.e., "A" (see fig. 2)) represents a relative importance of the page relative to other pages (i.e., "the linked structure of a database assign a rank to each document in the database" (see column 2, line 50-55); for each page (i.e., "A" (see fig. 2)) in the plurality of pages (i.e., "A, B, C" (see fig. 2)), recursively distributing the page's authority weight over pages that belong to a collection of pages

links (see column 2, line 67+ and column 3, line 1+), thereby establishing authority weights (i.e., "ranking" (column 4, line 47-54)) for at least some pages, within the collection (i.e., "a linked database" (column 3, line 55-68), that do no belong to the set of one or more pages; wherein the step of recursively distributing the page's authority weight (i.e., "ranking" (column 4, line 47-54)) includes establishing the page as a current page (i.e., "A" (fig. 2)) and repeatedly performing the following steps until an end condition is satisfied: a) following an outgoing link from the current page to a next page that belongs to the collection (from the document a, the link to the document B (see fig. 2); b) distributing a portion of the authority weight (i.e., "0.2" (see fig. 2, element B) to the next page (i.e., "B" (see fig. 2)); and c) establishing the next page (page C as current page)(see fig. 2) as the current page (i.e., "C" (fig. 2)); receiving a search query that is to be executed against the collection (see column 2, line 1-25 or claim 28); identifying a set of pages from the collection that match the search query (i.e., "page" (column 2, line 1-25)); determining how to present search results that list the pages (i.e., "list of its backlink document title" (see column 8, line 20-45)) that match the said search query based (i.e., "search terms" (column 8, line 20-45)), at least in part, on the authority weights (i.e., "ranking" (column 8, line 43-48)) associated with the pages that match the search query (i.e., "Once a set of documents is identified that match the search terms" (column 8, line 43-48)); and presenting the search results that list the pages that match the said search query based, at least in part, on the authority weights associated with the pages that match the search query(i.e., "Once a set of documents is identified that match the search terms" (column 8, line 43-48)).

With respect to claims 8-9, Page discloses effecting the search result list comprises one or more of reordering search hits (see column 6, line 1-5) and highlighting search hits (highly visible links) (see column 7, line 27-35).

With respect to claims 12-13, Page discloses combining an authority vector for one or more predetermine reference pages with an authority vector for one or more user-specific pages of the plurality of pages (see column 8, line 40+).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,999) in view of Haveliwala et al. ("Topic Sensitive PageRank", internet citation, 7 may 2002, pages 1-17).

With respect to claims 10-11, Page discloses all limitations of claimed invention recited in claim 1 except for the end condition is that a predetermined number o links are traversed and threshold of authority weight. However, Haveliwala et al. discloses the end condition is that a predetermined number o links are traversed and threshold of authority weight (see page 2, line 35-42). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Page's system's by having the different end condition in order to have rank stabilizes for the

stated purpose has been well known in the art as evidenced by teaching of Haveliwala (see page 2, last 2 line).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant made the following arguments:

- a. "Page et al. and Page in fact teach away from using a recursive technique.

Iterations globally treat all the nodes equally and spend most of the time on irrelevant nodes. In comparison, recursive method utilized local propagation-it never touches certain distant nodes. This results in computation of authority weights that is significantly faster than computing of a page specific page Rank vector" page 8, last paragraph and page 9, first paragraph.

In response the Applicant's argument, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because Page discloses of recursively distributing the page's authority weight as rejection above (From A→B→C). The claims do not support the Applicant's arguments as local propagation, distant nodes and a computation of authority weights. The claims do not recite local propagation, distant nodes or computation of authority weights.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung T. Vy whose telephone number is 571-2721954. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am - 5.30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571 272 1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hung T. Vy
Art Unit 2163.
February 4, 2007.



DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100